



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,750	10/22/2001	Mark Lucovsky	13768.198.1	4906
47973	7590	09/15/2005		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/003,750	Applicant(s) LUCOVSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner lan dai thi truong	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/01</u> <u>10/04/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1) Claim 1-12, 14-18, 22-28, 31- 36, 38, 41-43, 45-47, 48, 50, 52-54 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuatini (U.S. 2001/0047385), “Tuatini”, herein after.

Regarding to claims 1 and 22, 24, 27, 48 and 52, which are exemplary with claims 2, 17-18, 23, 31- 36, 38, 41-43 and 45-47:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for one of the plurality of applications to operate on data related to the identity, comprising:

An act of identifying a data structure that represents data that is to be operated on, the data being associated with the identity, the data structure being in accordance with a data format recognized by the service and the plurality of applications: (Tuatini discloses an “application architecture” which is equivalent to “a data structure” includes applications and an application framework. The application framework receives requests for services from clients. The application framework identifies application action handler components and application view handler components those can service the request and format the response. Then the application

framework sends a appropriate application program to implement client request: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of constructing a network message in accordance with a message format that is recognized by the service, the network message representing a request to perform the operation on the data structure, the network message identifying the data structure by identifying the identity: (Tuatini discloses the translation logic of translator, the view logic of view handler, and the business logic, those application functions use the services of application framework to implement their functionality. Tuatini discloses the client sends requests of services via “a request message” which is equivalent to “the network message representing a request” in a client-specific format to the application framework. Then the translator is responsible for translating the request received from the client a clients-specific format into the application-specific format defined for business logic. The application view handler is responsible for generating and sending a response that is in the client-specific format: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of dispatching the network message to the service: (Tuatini discloses the client sends “request messages” which is equivalent to “network message” of “an application program” which is equivalent to “the service”: page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

Regarding to claim 3:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data structure comprises a content data structure that represents the actual data of interest: (Tuatini discloses the client sends requests for “services of application programs” which is equivalent to “the actual data of interest”: page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

Regarding to claim 4, which is exemplary with claim 5:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data structure comprises an access control data structure; wherein the data structure comprises a systems data structure: (Tuatini discloses an “application architecture” which is equivalent to “a systems data structure” and “an access control data structure”: abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 40-52)

Regarding to claim 6:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data that is to be operated on is not directly accessed by the plurality of application, but is only directly accessed via the service: (Tuatini discloses the clients send “request for services” which is equivalent to “directly accessed via the service” to the application framework: abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

Regarding to claim 7, which is exemplary with claim 8:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of the granting the application access to the data structure prior to the acts of identifying, constructing, and dispatching: (Tuatini discloses the application framework “identifies” which is equivalent to “identifying” the application program which contains action handler and view handler, those can “service” which is equivalent to “dispatching” the request and “format” which is equivalent to “constructing” the response: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claim 9, which is exemplary with claim 10:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of determining an address of the service: (Tuatini discloses “the client sends the requests services of the application program,” this process is shared functionality with “determining an address of the service”: abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claims 11 and 26, which is exemplary with claim 12;

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claims 9 and 24, which further include:

An act of constructing a second network message in accordance with the message format that is recognized by a locator service, the second network message representing a query for the address using the identification of the identity: (Tuatini discloses the application framework identifies application action handler components and application view handler components, those can service the request and format the response. Then the application framework sends the application program to implement the client request to client: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of dispatching the second network message to the locator service: (the client sends the requests of services to “the application framework” which is equivalent to “the locator service”: page 3, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of receiving a response from the locator service that includes the address: (Tuatini discloses the client requests services by sending a request message in a client-specific format. Then the translator is responsible for translating the request received from a client system in the clients-specific format into the application-specific format defined for business logic. The application view handler is responsible for generating and sending a response that is in the client-

Art Unit: 2132

specific format: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claim 16:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of dispatching the network message to the service using a transport protocol that is compatible with transport over the Internet: (Although Tuatini does not explicitly disclose transport protocol; however this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Tuatini's system in order to perform communication between application framework and clients: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claims 25 and 49:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claims 24 and 48, which further includes wherein the one or more computer-readable media are physical storage media: (figure 30, item 3002; Figure 40, items 4005, 4010, 4015).

Regarding to claim 53:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for providing identity-centric data to one or more applications, the method including at least the following acts, comprising:

Storing identity-centric data relating to multiple identities in a data store associated with a data service: (Tuatini discloses a "configuration files" which is equivalent to "data store associated with a data service" that is global to all applications. The configuration files may specify the action handler that can service each request, specify translator for translating a

Art Unit: 2132

request from a client-specific protocol to a protocol used by the action handler: page 3, left column, lines 19-63, right column, lines 1-12).

Receiving various requests from the applications for identity-centric data relating to at least some of the identities: (Tuatini discloses the client sends the request messages in the client-specific format to the application framework. The application framework maps client request message format with configuration files to identify which application program includes the action handler that can service the request, and translator can transform bi-directions client-application protocol: page 3, right column, lines 29-43)

Providing the requested data to the requesting applications in response to their requests: (Tuatini discloses the application framework returns an appropriate application program to the client to implement the requests of services: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claims 14 and 15:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, further includes an act of dispatching the network request to a locator service that maintains a list of addresses for type-specific data services corresponding to the identity: (Tuatini discloses “the configuration file” which is equivalent to “list of addresses for type-specific data services corresponding to the identity” wherein the appropriate application program for request can be indicated: : page 3, left column, lines 19-63, right column, lines 1-12)

Regarding to claim 54:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for accessing identity-centric data via a data service which maintains identity-centric data relating to user identities, comprising:

Requesting identity-centric data relating to one or more of the user identities from the data service: (Tuatini discloses “an enterprise-wide login scheme” which is shared functionality with “an user identities data service.” The user is required to perform a single standard logging in to be able to send the requests of services to applications system. When a new corporate user begins interacting with enterprise application framework, the user registers to enterprise-wide system via creating a user-profile: page 15, right column, lines 50-63; page 16, right column, lines 1-63; page 17, left column, lines 1-63)

Receiving the requested data from the data service: (Tuatini discloses an LDAP (globally accessible directory service) and a messaging service, those can perform an authentication and shared services. The application framework returns the appropriate application program to the client to implement the requests of services: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43; page 16, right column, lines 1-63; page 17, left column, lines 1-63)

Regarding to claims 28 and 50:

Tuatini discloses a method as discuss in claims 27 and 48, which further includes prior to the act of performing the requested operation, an act of determining that the one of the plurality of applications is authorized to perform the requested operation on the data structure: (Tuatini discloses the user is required to perform an standard authorization before sending the request of service to the application framework: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page

Art Unit: 2132

3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43; page 16, right column, lines 1-63; page 17, left column, lines 1-63)

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37- 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini in view of Shigetomi et al. (U.S. 2002/0055951)

Regarding to claim 37:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents grocery list information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium that contains various services such as: “goods” which is equivalent to “grocery”, movie, MP3 and more, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini’s system in order to select a desired service from a plurality of services stored in a storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 38:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents in-box information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: “email” which is equivalent to “in-box information”, movie, MP3 and more, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini’s system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 39:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents music service information corresponding to the identity.

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: “MP3” which is equivalent to “music”, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini’s system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 40:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents calendar information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: calendar function, see (Shigetomi: page 1, right column, lines 51-52)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi's ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini's system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 44:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents favorite Web site information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: website function, see (Shigetomi: page 1, right column, lines 51-52)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi's ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini's system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Claims 29-30 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini in view of Susaki et al. (U.S. 6,189,032)

Regarding to claims 29-30, and 51:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach the method further comprises an act of maintaining a list of access rights to the data structure; and the act of determining that the one of the plurality of applications is authorized to perform the requested operation on the data structure comprises an act of referring to the list of access rights

However, Susaki discloses “a control table” which is equivalent to “a list of access rights”, see (Susaki: column 2, lines 55-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Susaki’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini’s system in order to control user access, see (Susaki: abstract, lines 1-18)

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini in view of Jenkins et al. (U.S. 6,678,682)

Regarding to claim 19:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is an individual

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be “users” which is equivalent to “individuals”, see (Jenkins: column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins’s ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini’s system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Regarding to claim 20:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is a group of individuals

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be “division” which is equivalent to “group of individuals,” see (column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins’s ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini’s system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Regarding to claim 21:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is an organization

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be “companies” which is equivalent to “organizations,” see (column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins’s ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini’s system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini in view of Robotham et al. (U.S. 2002/0015042)

Regarding to claim 13:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the act of constructing a network message in accordance with a message format that is recognized by the service comprises the following: an act of constructing a network message in accordance with the Simple Object Access Protocol

However, Robotham discloses requests and responses between client and server may use a protocol such as the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), see (Robotham: page 10, left column, lines 35-43)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Robotham's ideas of using Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for requesting and responding between client and server with Tuatini's system in order to allows the server to provide rendering services to any client that supports the protocol and the client can interpret the XML-encode contents provided by the server, see (Robotham: page 10, left column, lines 35-43)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Ldt
09/01/2005



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100